arXiv:gr-qc/9508045v2 18 Sep 1995

NBI-HE-95-27
August 1995
gr-qc/9508045

Lattice Quantum Gravity from Stochastic 3-Geometries

Naohito Nakazawa[1]

The Niels Bohr Institute, Blegdamsvej 17, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark

Abstract

I propose the Langevin equation for 3-geometries in the Ashtekar's formalism to describe 4D Euclidean quantum gravity, in the sense that the corresponding Fokker-Planck hamiltonian recovers the hamiltonian in 4D quantum gravity exactly. The stochastic time corresponds to the Euclidean time in the gauge, $N = 1$ and $N^i = 0$. In this approach, the time evolution in 4D quantum gravity is understood as a stochastic process where the quantum fluctuation of "triad "is characterized by the curvature at the one unit time step before. The lattice regularization of 4D quantum gravity is presented in this context.

---

[1] On leave of absence from Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Shimane University, Matsue 690, Japan. e-mail address: nakazawa@nbivax.nbi.dk, nakazawa@ps1.yukawa.kyoto-u.ac.jp

In the course to study QCD_4 in terms of the Nicoli-Langevin maps [1][2], it is shown that stochastic quantization [3] of 3D Chern-Simons theory recovers the time evolution in 4D Euclidean Yang-Mills theory where the stochastic (or fictitious) time is interpreted as the Euclidean time [4]. There is also another example, found in stochastic quantization of matrix models with loop space hamiltonian at the double scaling limit, that the stochastic time corresponds to the Euclidean time coordinate in 2D quantum gravity [5][6]. These facts motivate us to interpret the stochastic time as the Euclidean time coordinate even in 4D quantum gravity. In this short note, I point out that the time evolution in 4D quantum gravity is described by a Langevin equation for 3-geometries in terms of the Ashtekar's canonical field variables [7][8] by showing that the corresponding Fokker-Planck hamiltonian operator recovers the hamiltonian of 4D Euclidean quantum gravity exactly [9]. The stochastic time is interpreted as the Euclidean time with the gauge $N = 1$ and $N^i = 0$, where N and N^i are the lapse function and the shift vector, respectively. The Hartle-Hawking type boundary condition is naturally imposed in this scheme by specifying the initial probability distribution functional. Then I propose the lattice regularization of this approach with 3D cubic lattice. The corresponding F-P hamiltonian defines the lattice regularization for the hamiltonian of 4D Euclidean quantum gravity in Ashtekar's formalism.

At first, I introduce the basic Langevin equation for 3-geometries in the Ashtekar's variables to recover the hamiltonian of 4D quantum gravity with the corresponding F-P hamiltonian defined latter. The simplest form of the Langevin equation is defined by,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta A_i^a(x,\tau) &= \Delta\zeta_i^a(x,\tau) \ , \\ < \Delta\zeta_i^a(x,\tau)\Delta\zeta_j^b(y,\tau) >_\zeta &= \frac{\kappa}{2}\Delta\tau\epsilon^{abc} < F_{ij}^c(x,\tau) >_\zeta \delta^3(x-y) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $A_i^a(x,\tau)$ is a SU(2) gauge field in Euclidean Ashtekar's canonical formalism[1]. In this note, Latin indices "i,j,k,..."denote the spatial part of the spacetime coordinate indices. While the Latin letters "a,b,c,..."denote the spatial part of the internal indices.

---

[1] I use the notation, $F_{ij}^a = \partial_i A_j^a - \partial_j A_i^a + \epsilon^{abc}A_i^b A_j^c$, and $D_i^{ac} = \delta^{ac}\partial_i + \epsilon^{abc}A_i^b$. The field variable $A_i^a(x)$ is *real* in the Euclidean Ashtekar's formalism.

$x, y, ...$ denote spatial spacetime coordinates. The one step time evolution is defined by $\Delta A^a_i(x,\tau) \equiv A^a_i(x,\tau+\Delta\tau) - A^a_i(x,\tau)$ in (1). $\Delta\tau$ is the unit of the discretized stochastic time and τ denotes the stochastic time after n steps, $\tau \equiv n\Delta\tau$. The discretization of the stochastic time is considered for convenience of stochastic calculus and for understanding the precise meaning of the noise correlation. The coupling constant κ is defined by $\kappa \equiv 16\pi G$ with G, the gravitational (Newton's) constant in the natural unit $\hbar = c = 1$. The noise variable in (1) is not a simple white noise. The expectation value of the R.H.S. of the noise correlation is understood to be taken with respect to the noises up to the one unit time step before, $\tau - \Delta\tau$, in the sense of Ito's stochastic calculus [10]. More precisely, if the expectation value is taken only at a specified stochastic time, τ, then the R.H.S. of the noise correlation is not the expectation value since it does not depend on the noise at τ. It is also equivalent to require $< \Delta\zeta^a_i(\tau) >= 0$ in Ito's calculus.

The basic Langevin equation is manifestly covariant under the SU(2) local gauge transformation, $A^a_i(x) \rightarrow A^a_i + D^{ab}_i\omega^b(x)$. While it is not covariant under the spatial general coordinate transformation, $A^a_i(x) \rightarrow A^a_i + F^a_{ji}\xi^j(x)$, due to the divergent term, $\kappa\Delta\tau\delta^3(0)F^a_{ji}\xi^j$, which appears in the transformation of ΔA^a_i. This divergent term is formally (but not well-defined) cancelled by adding a term in the R.H.S. of the Langevin equation (1). The extra term comes from the invariant path-integral measure as we will see later.

In terms of the solution of the Langevin equation, the following equality holds.

$$\begin{aligned} < \Pi_{x,i,a}\delta(A^a_{i\;\zeta}(x,\tau) &- A^{a(final)}_i(x)) >_\zeta \\ &= < A^{(final)}|\mathrm{e}^{-\tau\tilde{H}_{FP}[\hat{\pi},\hat{A}]}|A^{(initial)} > , \\ &= < A^{(initial)}|\mathrm{e}^{-\tau H_{FP}[\hat{A},\hat{\pi}]}|A^{(final)} > \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

In the L.H.S., $A^a_{i\zeta}(x,\tau)$ denotes the solution of the Langevin equation with the initial condition, $A^a_i(x,0) = A^{a(initial)}_i(x)$. In the R.H.S., $\tilde{H}_{FP}[\hat{\pi},\hat{A}]$ is defined by,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_{FP}[\hat{\pi},\hat{A}] &= -\frac{\kappa}{4}\int d^3x\epsilon^{abc}\hat{\pi}^i_a(x)\hat{\pi}^j_b(x)\hat{F}^c_{ij}(x) \ , \\ H_{FP}[\hat{A},\hat{\pi}] &= -\frac{\kappa}{4}\int d^3x\epsilon^{abc}\hat{F}^c_{ij}(x)\hat{\pi}^i_a(x)\hat{\pi}^j_b(x) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

To show the equality (2), the commutation relation,

$$[\hat{\pi}^i_a(x)\ ,\hat{A}^b_j(y)] = \delta^b_a \delta^i_j \delta^3(x-y)\ , \tag{4}$$

and the vacuum, $|0>$ with $\hat{\pi}^i_a|0>=<0|\hat{A}^b_j = 0$, are assumed. The representation of the states is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} <A| &\equiv\ <0|\ \exp[\int d^3x A^a_i(x)\hat{\pi}^i_a(x)]\ , \\ |A> &=\ \Pi_{x,a,i}\delta(\hat{A}^a_i(x) - A^a_i(x))|0>\ . \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The Fokker-Planck hamiltonians (3) are just the hamiltonian for 4D quantum gravity without cosmological term in Ashtekar's variables [7] with different operator orderings[2]. The annihilation operator $\hat{\pi}^i_a$ is interpreted as the "triad "in the Euclidean Ashtekar's formalism. Namely[3], $\hat{\pi}^j_a(x) = -\frac{2i}{\kappa}\tilde{e}^j_a(x)$. The stochastic time evolution with the Langevin equation (1) corresponds to the Euclidean time evolution in 4D quantum gravity with the gauge fixing, $N=1$ and $N^i = 0$[4]. In the stochastic process (1), the "triad "plays the role of the noise variable and the "quantum fluctuation "of the triad is characterized by the curvature. Though the two expressions in (2) are precisely equivalent, the second definition of the F-P hamiltonian in (3) has an advantage for further discussion. This is because the vacuum satisfies the (local) hamiltonian constraint with the operator ordering in H_{FP}, $<0|\mathcal{H}(\hat{A}(x),\hat{\pi}(x)) = \mathcal{H}(\hat{A}(x),\hat{\pi}(x))|0>=0$, where $H_{FP}[\hat{A},\hat{\pi}] \equiv \int d^3x \mathcal{H}(\hat{A}(x),\hat{\pi}(x))$. It should be noticed that the operator ordering of the F-P hamiltonian operator H_{FP} is deferent from that appeared in the F-P equation for the probability distribution.

Let us consider the initial distribution dependence of the probability distribution functional by averaging the expectation value (2) with respect to the initial probability distribution. It is defined by integrating out the initial configuration $A^{a(initial)}_i(x)$, on which the solution of the Langevin equation $A^a_{i\zeta}(x,\tau)$ depends, with the distribution, $P[A^{(initial)},0]$, in the L.H.S. of (2). The integration of $A^{a(initial)}_i$ gives a generalized form of the distribution functional $P[A,\tau]$, which is defined by $< O[A_\zeta](\tau) >_\zeta \equiv \int \mathcal{D}AO[A]P[A,\tau]$, as follows

---

[2] For a detailed derivation of the F-P hamiltonian operator from the Langevin equation, see also Ref. [6].

[3] $\tilde{e}^i_a \equiv q^{1/2}e^i_a$, where $q = \det(q_{ij})$ with spatial metric $q^{ij} = e^i_a e^j_a$.

[4] In 2D quantum gravity, it is observed that this gauge fixing recovers the time evolution defined in non-critical string field theories[11].

$$P[A,\tau] = \int \mathcal{D}A^{initial} < A^{initial}|P[\hat{A},0]\mathrm{e}^{-\tau H_{FP}[\hat{A},\hat{\pi}]}|A > \ . \tag{6}$$

For an arbitrary observable $O[A]$, the average with respect to the initial value distribution also gives,

$$< O[A_\zeta(\tau)] >_\zeta = \int \mathcal{D}A^{initial} < A^{initial}|P[\hat{A},0]\mathrm{e}^{-\tau H_{FP}[\hat{A},\hat{\pi}]}O[\hat{A}]|0 > \ . \tag{7}$$

In the definition of the expectation value in the L.H.S. of (7), the average is also taken with respect to the initial values with the distribution $P[A^{initial},0]$. For example, eq.(2) is given for $O[A] = \Pi_{x,a,i}\delta\Big(A^a_i(x) - A^{a(final)}_i(x)\Big)$, with the initial distribution, $P[A,0] = \Pi_{x,a,i}\delta\Big(A^a_i(x) - A^{a(initial)}_i(x)\Big)$.

Eq.(7) leads the time evolution equation for the expectation values of observables,

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} < O[A_\zeta(x,\tau)] >_\zeta = - < H_{FP}[A^b_j(x), \frac{\delta}{\delta A^b_j(x)}]O[A^a_i(x)]|_{A^a_i(x)=A^a_{i\zeta}(x,\tau)} >_\zeta \ , \tag{8}$$

as it is expected from the Langevin equation (1). I here notice that the initial condition dependence in (7) implies a constraint for initial distribution itself due to the equation,

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} < O[A_\zeta(x,\tau)] >_\zeta = - \int \mathcal{D}A^{in}P[A^{in},0]H_{FP}[A^{in}, \frac{\delta}{\delta A^{in}}] < A^{in}|\mathrm{e}^{-\tau H_{FP}[\hat{A},\hat{\pi}]}O[\hat{A}]|A > \ . \tag{9}$$

The existence of the equilibrium limit requires that the R.H.S. in (9) should be zero at the infinite stochastic time. A trivial solution of this constraint is the vanishing curvature at any spatial points, $P[A,0] = \Pi_{x,a,ij}\delta\Big(F^a_{ij}(x)\Big)$. This initial distribution, however, should be excluded because the R.H.S. of (8) is identically zero even at finite stochastic time and there is no time development. In general, if we choose a solution of the hamiltonian constraint as the initial value distribution, obviously there is no time evolution in the Fokker-Planck type equation (8). Especially, the constraint does not allow us to solve the Langevin equation with the initial condition $A^{a(initial)}_i(x) = 0$ for the existence of the time evolution.

To specify the physical boundary condition and to study a class of solutions for the hamiltonian constraint of 4D quantum gravity in this context, we may choose the initial condition which generates a nontrivial time evolution

$$P_{H-H}[A,0] = \Pi_{x\neq z_0,a,i}\delta\Big(F^a_{ij}(x))\Big) \ . \tag{10}$$

The spacetime point, $x = z_0$ at $\tau = 0$, is identified to the point where the 3D spatial manifold is absorbed into nothing in an analogous sense of the Hartle-Hawking type boundary condition [12].

As it is clear from (7), initial distributions and observables are the key quantities to specify 3-boundaries on quantized 4D spacetime manifolds in this approach. These quantities are the solution of the momentum constraint and the SU(2) Gauss law constraint. There are some candidates which may be useful to characterize 3-boundaries, such as the extrinsic curvature term, 3D Chern-Simons term, topological invariants [13] and loop variables [14] for which the present formalism can be applied. Under the appropriate choice of these observables, one can show the gauge invariance (gauge independence) of the expectation value of observables, following the standard method to fix the gauge in the Langevin equation [15][16]. For spatial general coordinate invariance and SU(2) gauge invariance, the gauge fixed Langevin equation is given by,

$$\Delta A^a_i(x,\tau) = -\Delta\tau\{D^{ab}_i\Psi^b + F^a_{ij}\Phi^j\}(x,\tau) + \Delta\zeta^a_i(x,\tau) \ , \tag{11}$$

with the same noise correlation as eq.(1). The gauge fixing corresponds to choose the multiplier fields, $\Psi^a(x)$ and $\Phi^i(x)$, as specified functionals of A^a_i's. Then, the F-P hamiltonians are given by,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{H}^{(g.f.)}_{FP}[\hat{\pi},\hat{A}] &= \tilde{H}_{FP} + \int d^3x\Big\{\Phi^i(x)\tilde{C}^M_i(x) + \Psi^a(x)\tilde{C}^a_G(x)\Big\} \ , \\ H^{(g.f.)}_{FP}[\hat{A},\hat{\pi}] &= H_{FP} - \int d^3x\Big\{\Phi^i(x)C^M_i(x) + \Psi^a(x)C^a_G(x)\Big\} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

instead of eq.(3), with

$$\begin{aligned} C^M_i(x) &\equiv \hat{F}^a_{ij}\hat{\pi}^j_a \ , \\ C^a_G(x) &\equiv \hat{D}^{ab}_i\hat{\pi}^i_b \ . \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

C_j^M and C_G^a defines the momentum constraint and the Gauss law constraint, respectively. In the first expression in (12), $\tilde{C}_j^M$ and $\tilde{C}_G^a$, are defined by replacing the operator orderings in the original constraints so that the conjugate momentum, $\hat{\pi}_b^j$'s, are gathered to the left to A_i^a's in the constraints. The probability distribution and the expectation value defined by the Langevin equation (11) are given by eqs.(6) (7) together with the F-P hamiltonian (12) instead of (3). As it is clear from (7) with the second expression of the F-P hamiltonian in (12), the insertion of constraints does not change the expectation value of the observables provided that the observables are the solution of these constraints, such as the extrinsic curvature term and 3D Chern-Simons term. We notice that the operator ordering in the second expression in (12) is essential for the local gauge invariance in our definition of the vacuum, namely the vacuum is gauge invariant, $< 0|C_i^M = C_i^M|0 >=< 0|C_G^a = C_G^a|0 >= 0$, with the operator ordering in (13). Therefore, (11) gives the same expectation value for arbitrary observables as one given by (1), provided that these observables are the solution of the constraints in (13). The gauge fixing in (1) corresponds to $N = 1$, $\Phi^i = \Psi^a = 0$, where Φ^i is essentially the shift vector. On the other hand, as for the partition function defined by the Langevin equation (11), which is given by (6) with (12), the gauge fixing procedure leads a gauge invariant (more precisely BRS invariant) partition function with a suitable choice of multiplier field, Φ^i and Ψ^a, as functionals of dynamical variables. To fix the gauge more generally for the reparametrization invariance of the time coordinate, one has to introduce the lapse function by multiplying the R.H.S. of the noise correlation (1) with it and choose it as a specified functional of A_i^a's. Though the problem is not addressed in this note explicitly, it is possible following the general framework [16].

Now let us consider the regularization procedure in this context. As it has been noticed in (1), an extra term is necessary for the covariance of the Langevin equation under the spatial general coordinate transformation. It is a direct consequence of the fact that the Ito's calculus picks up the Jacobian factor which comes from the change of variables in the path-integral measure [17][21]. One way to specify the path-integral measure in configuration space is to introduce a regularization for the noise correlation in (1). I here propose a lattice regularization of the Langevin equation and the noise correlation (1) in which the invariant property of the regularized Langevin equation in the sense of Ito's calculus naturally introduces the invariant path-integral measure in the configuration space of link variables.

The lattice regularized Langevin equation is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta U_l(\tau) &= \Big\{\Delta W_l(\tau) + \Delta\tau|\mathcal{G}|^{1/2}(D_L)^b_{l'}\Big(|\mathcal{G}|^{-1/2}\mathcal{G}^{ab}_{ll'}\Big)T^a\Big\}U_l(\tau) \\ |\mathcal{G}| &\equiv \det(\mathcal{G}^{ab}_{ll'}) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Here the dynamical variable and the noise variable, U_l and ΔW_l respectively, have been assigned on the link, $l \equiv (x, i)$, of 3-dimensional cubic lattice, which is specified by the site x and its nearest neighbor in the i-th direction $x + \hat{i}$. U_l is an element of SU(2) group in the adjoint representation. While the noise, ΔW_l is algebra-valued in the adjoint representation, $\Delta W_l = \Delta W^a_l T^a$, with $[T^a\ ,T^b] = \epsilon^{abc}T^c$. $(D_L)^a_l$ is the left Lie derivative on the group manifold defined by

$$[(D_L)^a_l,\ U_{l'}] = \delta^{ll'}T^aU_l\ , \quad [(D_L)^a_l,\ (D_L)^b_l] = -\epsilon^{abc}(D_L)^c_l\ . \tag{15}$$

The regularized Langevin equation describes the one step time evolution of the link variables, $U_l(\tau+\Delta\tau) = U_l(\tau) + \Delta U_l(\tau)$. It should be noticed that $U_l(\tau+\Delta\tau)$ is also an element of SU(2) group. The quantity $\mathcal{G}^{ab}_{ll'}$, is interpreted as the inverse of the "superspace "metric, here the superspace is spanned by the link variables $\{U_l\}$. The inverse of the superspace metric is given in the following regularized correlation of the noises defined on the links, $l = (x, i)$ and $l' = (y, j)$.

$$< (\Delta W_l)_{\alpha\beta}(\tau)(\Delta W_{l'})_{\gamma\delta}(\tau) >= \Delta\tau < \mathcal{G}^{ab}_{ll'}(\tau)T^a_{\alpha\beta}T^b_{\gamma\delta} > , \tag{16}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}^{ab}_{ll'}(\tau)T^a_{\alpha\beta}T^b_{\gamma\delta} &= g_0\delta_{x,y}\Big\{\delta_{\alpha\delta}(\sqcap_{i\neq j}U)_{\beta\gamma} + \delta_{\beta\gamma}(\sqcap_{i\neq j}U)_{\alpha\delta} - \delta_{\beta\delta}(\sqcap_{i\neq j}U)_{\alpha\gamma} - \delta_{\alpha\gamma}(\sqcap_{i\neq j}U)_{\beta\delta}\Big\}\ , \\ (\sqcap_{i\neq j}U)_{\alpha\gamma} &\equiv \frac{1}{2}\Big\{(U(x,i)U(x+\hat{i},j)U(x+\hat{j},i)^\dagger U(x,j)^\dagger)_{\alpha\gamma} \\ &- (U(x,j)U(x+\hat{j},i)U(x+\hat{i},j)^\dagger U(x,i)^\dagger)_{\alpha\gamma}\Big\}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

g_0 is an arbitrary constant.

The lattice regularization has been determined from the following requirements. (i) The Langevin equation (14) and the noise correlation (16) should be covariant under the SU(2) local gauge transformation,

$$\begin{aligned} U(x,i) &\rightarrow V^{-1}(x)U(x,i)V(x+\hat{i}) \ , \\ \Delta W(x,i) &\rightarrow V^{-1}(x)\Delta W(x,i)V(x) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

(ii) The model recovers the Langevin equation and the noise correlation in (1) at the naive continuum limit defied by, $U(x,i) \approx 1 + A_i^b T^b a$ and $\Delta W(x,i) \approx \Delta\zeta_i^b T^b a$. At the limit, the coupling constant and the stochastic time are scaled, $g_0 a^2 \rightarrow \frac{\kappa}{2}$ and $\Delta\tau \rightarrow a^{-1}\Delta\tau$, as the lattice spacing a goes to zero, $a \rightarrow 0$. (iii) The regularized Langevin equation (14) is covariant under the "general coordinate transformation "in superspace, $\{U(x,i)\}$.

$$U(x,i)_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow V(x,i)_{\alpha\beta}[U] \ , \tag{19}$$

where $V(x,i)$ is also an element of SU(2) group in the adjoint representation and an arbitrary functional of $U(y,j)$. The second term in the R.H.S. in (14) is necessary for the invariance in Ito's calculus [17]. The requirement (iii) is introduced to realize the spatial coordinate invariance in the lattice regularization. By using these requirements, it is straightforward to construct the model in the fundamental representation. It is given by simply replacing the inverse of the superspace metric (17) to the following one.

$$\mathcal{G}_{ll'}^{ab}(\tau)T_{\alpha\beta}^a T_{\gamma\delta}^b = g_0'\delta_{x,y}\Big\{\delta_{\beta\gamma}(\sqcap_{i\neq j}U)_{\alpha\delta} - \delta_{\alpha\delta}(\sqcap_{i\neq j}U)_{\gamma\beta}\Big\} \ . \tag{20}$$

By applying the argument in Ref. [17], I have introduced the second term in the R.H.S. of (14) for the covariance of the lattice regularized Langevin equation under the transformation (19). The similar argument is formally possible even in the non-regularized version (1) if we identify the R.H.S. of the noise correlation in (1) to the inverse of the continuum superspace metric. Indeed, from the requirement (ii), the naive continuum limit of these equations, (14) (15) and (16), coincides with those in eq.(1) except a term which comes from the second term in the R.H.S. of the Langevin equation (14). The extra term has the same structure as the second term in the regularized Langevin equation

(14) if we identify the noise correlation in (1) as the inverse of the superspace metric in Ashtekar's configuration variables. The extra contribution which comes from this term under the spatial general coordinate transformation formally cancels the divergent term, $\kappa\Delta\tau\delta^3(0)F^a_{ji}\xi^j$, which appears in the transformation in ΔA^a_i. The extra term appeared in the naive continuum limit of (14) actually represents the contribution from the path-integral measure and it is necessary for the invariant property of the Langevin equation (1) in a formal sense, however, it is not well-defined without regularization. A more detailed discussion, especially on the covariant property of the lattice regularization under the spatial general coordinate transformation in the present approach, will be published in elsewhere [18].

By using the same method developed in the continuum version, one can derive the regularized version of the expectation value, such as (6). I only comment on the three important consequences of the lattice regularized Langevin equation (14). The first is the corresponding lattice regularized F-P hamiltonian which is given by,

$$H_{reg} = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{l,l'} |\mathcal{G}|^{1/2}(D_L)^a_l\{|\mathcal{G}|^{-1/2}\mathcal{G}^{ab}_{ll'}(D_L)^b_{l'}\} \ . \tag{21}$$

The F-P hamiltonian defines the lattice regularization of the hamiltonian for 4D Euclidean quantum gravity in Ashtekar's formalism[5]. The second is the invariant measure which appears in the path-integral representation of the regularized expectation value of an observable (6) after integrating out the canonical momentum variables, $(D_L)^a_l$.

$$\mathcal{D}U \equiv \mathcal{G}^{-1/2}\Pi_l dU_l \ , \tag{22}$$

where dU denotes the left invariant Haar measure. The measure is invariant under the general coordinate transformation in superspace (19).

The third is the Schwinger-Dyson equation in this context. It is given by [6]

$$< |\mathcal{G}|^{1/2}\Big\{(D_L)^b_{l'}\Big(|\mathcal{G}|^{-1/2}\mathcal{G}^{ab}_{ll'}\Big)\Big\}T^aU_l >= 0 \ , \tag{23}$$

---

[5] In Refs. [19][20], similar lattice regularized hamiltonians have been discussed without the contribution of $|\mathcal{G}|$.

at an equilibrium limit, $\lim_{\tau\to\infty} < \dot{U} >= 0$.

In this note, I have pointed out that there exist a Langevin system for 3-geometries which describes the time evolution in 4D Euclidean quantum gravity. There have been some attempts to define 4D quantum gravity in the context of stochastic quantization [22][23][24][25] by introducing the stochastic time as the fifth time coordinate, however, the philosophy of the present approach is different from these previous works. The strategy I would like to adopt here is to characterize the 3-boundaries in the 4D space-time manifold by using the solution of both the momentum constraint and the Gauss law constraint to prepare the initial distribution and the observables. Then the remaining constraint is only the hamiltonian constraint which may be realized at the infinite stochastic time limit provided there exists an equilibrium limit. This is actually the idea which we have learned in stochastic quantization of matrix models in loop space for 2D quantum gravity, where the stochastic time is the proper Euclidean time and the hamiltonian constraint is realized as the Virasoro constraint in loop space [5][6]. In order to work in this program, one has to construct observables in the lattice regularization. It should be noticed that the Wilson loop is not a spatially general coordinate invariant observable in the present lattice regularization [18].

In the Langevin equation (1) and (14), the "triad "in Ashtekar's variables are realized as noise variables, which presumably represents the stochastic 3-geometries. The lattice regularized Langevin equation (14) may provide a possible basis for numerical simulation in 4D quantum gravity. The problem of the present scheme is that the noise correlation in the basic Langevin equations, (1) and (14), are not positive definite. It would force the Langevin equations to be complex. The field variables, though they are real in the Euclidean Ashtekar's formalism, would also become complex in the time evolution. The point would be main difficulty for the numerical analysis in this scheme. One way to deal with the problem may be to extend the Langevin equation (1) to a class of more general gauge fixing. It is always possible by multiplying the noise correlation in (1) with lapse function. Then one may chose the lapse function so that the noise correlation keeps the value to be positive definite. It is an open question if this gauge fixing procedure, a choice of non-trivial lapse function, make sense in the lattice regularization. It is also an open question how we introduce the cosmological term in (1) and (14). Apart from these questions, the description with the Langevin equation has a topological feature in the sense of Nicoli-Langevin map. Such a topological feature would relax another difficulty, renormalizability of quantum gravity. I hope that the approach is useful for deeper understanding of quantum gravity.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank J. Ambjorn, J.Greensite, A. Krasnitz, H. B. Nielsen and M. Weis for enlightening discussion and comments. He also wishes to thank J. L. Petersen for continuous encouragement and all members in high energy group at Niels Bohr Institute for hospitality.

References

[1] G. Parisi and N. Sourlas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**(1979)744.

[2] H. Nicolai, Phys. Lett. **B89**(1980)341; Nucl. Phys. **B176**(1980)419.

[3] G. Parisi and Y. Wu, Sci. Sin. **24**(1981)483.

[4] M. Claudson and M.B.Halpern, Phys. Lett. **B151**(1985)281.

[5] A. Jevicki and Rodrigues, Nucl. Phys. **B421**(1994)278

[6] N. Nakazawa, NBI-HEP-94-54, hep-th/9411232, Modern Phys. Lett. A, in press.

[7] A. Ashtekar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**(1986)2244; Phys. Rev. **36**(1987)1587.

[8] T. Jacobson and L. Smolin, Phys. Lett. **B196**(1987)39.

[9] N. Nakazawa, NBI-HEP-95-26, “Stochastic Quantization of Real Symmetric Matrix Models and Field Theory of Non-Orientable Strings ”to appear in the proceedings of the Moscow 6-th Quantum Gravity Seminar, June 12-19, 1995 Moscow.

[10] K. Ito, Proc. Imp. Acad **20**(1944)519.
K. Ito and S. Watanabe, in *Stochastic Differential Equations*, ed K. Ito (Wiley, New York, 1978).

[11] M. Fukuma, N. Ishibashi, H. Kawai and M. Ninomiya, Nucl. Phys. **427**(1994)139.

[12] J. B. Hartle and S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. **28**(1983)2960.

[13] E. Witten, Comm. Math. Phys. **121**(1989)351.

[14] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, Nucl. Phys. **B331**(1990)80.

[15] D. Zwanziger, Nucl. Phys. **B192**(1981)259.
L. Baulieu and D. Zwanziger, Nucl. Phys. **B193**(1981)163.

[16] N. Nakazawa, Nucl. Phys. **B335**(1990)546.

[17] R. Graham, Z. Phys. **B26**(1977), 397;
Phys. Lett. **A109**(1985)209.

[18] N. Nakazawa, in preparation.

[19] P. Renteln and L. Smolin, Class. Quantum Grav. **6**(1989)275.

[20] R. Loll, Nucl. Phys. **B444**(1995)619.

[21] N. Nakazawa, Mod. Phys. Lett. **7**(1992)841.

[22] J. Sakamoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. **70**(1983)1424.

[23] H. Rumpf, Phys. Rev. **33**(1986)942.

[24] N. Nakazawa, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A5**(1990)2407;
Prog. Theor. Phys. **86**(1991)1053.

[25] J. Greensite Nucl. Phys. **B361**(1991)729.